

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

A replacement drawing sheet with FIGURE 2 is submitted herewith. Reference numeral 3 has been added to FIGURE 2 to identify the groove, separate from reference numeral 5 which refers to the wear preventing coating.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{LLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated February 27, 2009. Applicant thanks Examiner Amiri for the analysis contained in the Office Action. Applicant has carefully considered cited art and the comments provided in the Office Action, and respectfully submits that the claims submitted herewith are patentable over the cited art. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Non-elected species

Applicant has canceled claim 2 and has amended claims 3-9 to depend solely on claim 1. These amendments are made without prejudice to applicant's right to seek patent protection for the non-elected species in a divisional application.

Objection to the Drawings Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(4)

Applicant notes that reference numeral 5 refers to the wear preventing coating, which fills the groove on the outside, and also covers the groove on the inside. Applicant submits that this is properly identified in FIGURE 2. However to clarify what is being labeled, applicant has added reference numeral 3 to separately identify the groove. Reference numeral 3 is first referenced in FIGURE 1.

Rejection of Claims 1, 5/1, 6/1 and 7/1 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 5/1, 6/1 and 7/1 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson (U.S. Patent No. 4,720,204) in view of Volkmann et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,326,825). The Applicant respectfully traverses this objection.

In the amendment submitted on October 31, 2008, applicant amended claim 1 to refer to "the internal diameter of the cylindrical hollow part being greater than the internally threaded cavity," which is not taught by Johnson. The Examiner has cited Volkmann et al. to make up the deficiency in Johnson.

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{LLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100

Johnson provides a bore between the couplings. The sole purpose of the bore is to install a safety line. If the safety line were not used, there would be no bore. However, it would be impossible to provide the safety line if the coupling were to be designed with a hollow part with a larger diameter than the threaded cavity. The safety line has stop lugs (42 and 43) that require a surface to retain them. If the bore has a larger diameter than the threaded coupling, there would be no anchor. In other words, the motivation to provide Johnson with a cavity is to install a safety line, but if Johnson were modified to have a cavity similar to what is claimed, the safety line could not be used. There would therefore be no motivation to do so.

Furthermore, the teachings of Johnson and Volkmann et al. are not compatible, as each is designed to act against different forces. Volkmann et al. teaches a shear nut, described as a fastener device (40) with a shear section (43) that fractures under the application of a predetermined torque. The fastener device (40) engages a pin (20) to hold sheets (11 and 12) together. Johnson intends the narrow waist at the breakaway section (26) to act as a pivot point for any lateral forces that are applied to the banner arm, such that a smaller diameter is preferred. There would therefore be no motivation to design it to fracture upon the application of a predetermined torque.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over Johnson in view of Volkmann et al. As claim claims 5, 6 and 7 are dependent upon claim 1, applicant submits that these claims are also patentable.

Rejection of Claims 3 and 4 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3 and 4 currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson in view of Volkmann et al. and Uramoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,642,011). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Uramoto et al. describes rust inhibitors, and therefore does not make up the deficiencies described above with respect to Johnson and Volkmann et al. Applicant therefore submits that claims 3/1 and 4/1 are patentable over Johnson in view of Volkmann et al. and Uramoto et al.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing arguments, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7 are in condition for allowance. Furthermore, claims 8 and 9, as they depend from claim 1, should be rejoined and allowed. Applicant, therefore, requests the early issue of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR
JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PELLC}



Kevan L. Morgan
Registration No. 42,015
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1712

KLM:meb

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PELLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100